

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 20, 21, 40 and 41 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-41 are pending and under consideration.

INTERVIEW WITH THE EXAMINER

First, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicant's representative on January 23, 2008, at which time the outstanding issues in this case were discussed. Arguments similar to the ones developed hereinafter were presented and the Examiner indicated that in light of the arguments, the amended claims appear to be distinguish over the cited prior art, and he would reconsider the outstanding grounds for rejection upon formal submission of a response.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-6, 20-26, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,192,484 to Asano (hereinafter "Asano").

Applicants amend herewith independent claims 1, 20, 21 and 40 to replace the term "reproducing information" in view of the specification to distinguish from the meaning of interpretation "restoring" asserted in the Office Action which is disclosed by the prior art reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,484 to Asano ("Asano"). In the independent claims, the word "reproducing" is replaced with "playing-back."

In view of the claim amendments applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20, 21, 40 and 41 together with claims 2-19 and 22-39 depending from claims 1 and 21, respectively, patentably distinguish over Asano, at least by reciting, for example in claim 1 "a reproducing unit **playing-back** the second information when a result of the check by the falsification checking unit is that the second information is not falsified. "

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 7-12 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Asano in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0060703 to Tsukada ("Tsukada"). Claims 13-19, and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Asano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,780 to Bradley ("Bradley").

Tsukada and Bradley do not correct or compensate for the above-identified failure of Asano in anticipating all the features of the independent claims. Therefore, claims 7-19 and 27-39 are patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from claim 1 and 21 from which they respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, §714.13 set forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 10, 2008

By: L Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501